

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/025,907	12/26/2001	Yun-Ho Jung	8733.565.00 7489		
	7590 03/07/2007 ONG & ALDRIDGE LLP	EXAMINER			
1900 K STREET, NW			PADGETT, MARIANNE L		
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1762		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/025,907	JUNG, YUN-HO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Marianne L. Padgett	1762		

	Marianne L. Padgett	1762	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires $\frac{1}{2}$ months from the maining date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		in the final rejection, wh	ichover is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dar	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	is of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further composed. They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belom) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NO ⁻ w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or			ine issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment ((PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Americanon (,1 10L-52+j.
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-14</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-4</u> .	·		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	ice because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☐ Other:	MARIANNE PADGETT PRIMARY EXAMINER	T	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The amendment of independent claims 5 & 11 to require the mask be stepped "to a fixed position" is a new issue not previously considered, for which it is necessary to consider (1) if this amendment has support, as applicant did not cite where the support for this amendment is to be found in the original specification; (2) what is meant by "fixed position within the block using the mask stage" & how long it remains "fixed", i.e how one can be "repeatedly melting and crystallize the next portions of the block adjacent to the first portions within the block whenever the mask steps in the first direction..." if that position is "fixed", since being fixed & stepping the mask appear to be contradictory requirements, hence 112, second paragraph needs to be considered; (3) after meaning and support are determined, how this new limitation relates to the previously applied prior art of Im et al. (6,368,945 B1) needs to be considered, as well as search for this new limitation if it is considered not to be consistent with the teachings of in et al.

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

Applicant's proposed amendment would remove 112, first paragraph rejection over the New Matter rejection.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

While removing the 112, first paragraph rejection of the actions of 10/10/2006 & 7/20/2006, requires search and consideration of new issues as discussed above in the note of section 3.

MLP/dictation software 3/5/2007